



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

nantal friction is produced : the result is a vowel which may be described as the high-back-wide. It is the unrounded form of the short English (and German) *u* in *foot*, *put*, *book*, etc. Those trying to pronounce it by unrounding that familiar sound should be very careful not to overdo it by *spreading* the lips—which only too readily happens in a case like this. The lips should remain in what might be described as a neutral position. For this new sound I propose to use the symbol [a], which seems to be quite appropriate for a vowel the acoustic effect of which is very similar to that of [a].

e. g. *wir* [vīa];
ohr [ōa];
flur [flūa];
star [tāa].

Final unstressed *-er*, so frequent as a termination, has assumed the same sound, the [ε] having been completely merged in the [a].

e. g. *jeder* [jēda];
heber [lēba];
bürger [bygja].

The same pronunciation prevails when the *-er* is followed by an inflectional *n* or *m*; thus, *-ern* and *-en* can be easily distinguished although the *r* is no longer pronounced as a consonant.

e. g. *bessern* [besan];
Büchern [bȳgan];
Bürgern [bygjan] }
bürge [bygjn]. }

HEINRICH MUTSCHMANN.

Bonn.

THE WORKS OF JEAN RENART, POET, AND THEIR RELATION TO GALE- RAN DE BRETAGNE. I.

In an article which was found among the papers of Gaston Paris, and published a few years ago in the *Romania*,¹ the suggestion is offered that the Jean Renart, who wrote the *Lai de l'Ombre*,² is

the author also of the romance of *Escoufle*,³ and probably the writer to whom we owe the poem of *Guillaume de Dole*.⁴ This idea had already been advanced by Paul Meyer,⁵ with especial reference to *Ombre* and *Escoufle*, and seems to have been entertained somewhat later by Adolph Mussafia in regard to *Escoufle* and *Guillaume de Dole*.⁶ Neither Meyer nor Mussafia coincide with Paris' view to its entire extent, nor do they agree with each other in their choice of poems, but their statements and proofs so overlap that we may take it for granted that a new study of the subject would lead them to a practical unanimity of opinion. And this opinion would be the one expressed by Gaston Paris.

Should this belief in the common authorship of *Ombre*, *Escoufle* and *Guillaume de Dole* become general, and the three poems be regarded as the work of one and the same man, then Jean Renart, who is named only in *Ombre*, takes rank among the best French poets of the Middle Ages. Indeed, he might be safely assigned a place second only to Wace, Marie de France, Benoît de Sainte-More, Thomas and Chrétien de Troyes. *Escoufle* and *Guillaume de Dole* are counted among the most important of the *romans d'aventure*. The popularity of *Ombre* is attested by its presence in not less than six manuscripts. Consequently we are doing only tardy justice to Jean Renart in calling him from out the crowd of minor poets to a seat among the greater ones. At the same time, in restoring to him what is his own we are diminishing, to our regret, the already limited number of talented men who were engaged in the cultivation of the vernacular. Three poets of considerable ability would be combined in one. The literary reputation of Jean Renart, therefore, is not alone concerned in the decision that may be reached. The consideration in which the educated classes of the day held composition in the mother tongue is also involved to a certain ex-

³ Edited by H. Michelant and P. Meyer for the *Société des anciens textes français*, Paris, 1894.

⁴ Edited by G. Servois for the *Société des anciens textes français*, Paris, 1893.

⁵ See Introduction to *Escoufle*, pp. xli-l.

⁶ See *Sitzungsberichte der phil.-hist. Classe der kaiserl. Akademie der Wissenschaften*, Vienna, 1896, Abh. xiv; 1897, Abh. vii. In latter article, p. 33, n. 1.

¹ Vol. xxxii, 481-551. See particularly pp. 487, 488.

² Edited by Joseph Bédier, Fribourg, 1890.

tent, and a solution of the question of the origin of these three poems, common or otherwise, would aid us in estimating the valuation set on French literature at the height of its Medieval flowering.

Before attempting to collect the evidence cited by the three scholars mentioned—Gaston Paris does not in fact adduce any—and supplementing it by any further details, it may be advisable to refer to the statement made some years ago in this periodical,⁷ that the author of *Guillaume de Dole* was acquainted with an episode of *Escoufle*, and near the end of the poem made a comparison between the villain in *Escoufle*, the hawk, and the villain of his own narrative, the seneschal. This knowledge of *Escoufle* on the part of the author of *Guillaume de Dole* not only proves that *Escoufle* was the earlier poem of the two, but also indicates a familiarity with the story which might be expected of one who had had a share in its composition. Such a reference to another work might be prompted by pride of authorship.

However, the first step to take in order to arrive at a more exact comprehension of the mutual relation of *Ombre*, *Escoufle* and *Guillaume de Dole* would be to study all three together, rather than any two of the three, as has been done heretofore. Now, the most striking evidence of likeness or unlikeness would be presented by their versification. Paul Meyer has already called attention to many correspondences.⁸ We need only to add to his citations. The poems are unequal in length. *Ombre* contains less than a thousand lines, *Guillaume de Dole* numbers over five thousand six hundred, *Escoufle* runs to more than nine thousand. Yet in spite of this inequality their percentage of broken couplets remains practically the same: 60 % for *Ombre*, 58 % for *Guillaume de Dole*, 62 % for *Escoufle*. The proportion of three-line sentences⁹ which follow the break in the couplet is also uniformly small: 2 % in *Ombre*, 7 % in *Guillaume de Dole*, 3.5 % in *Escoufle*. On the other hand, the amount of overflow verse in all three poems is unusual; as many as twenty overflows in the thousand lines of *Ombre*, and fifteen in a thousand for sections of *Escoufle* and *Guillaume de Dole*. In the ratio of feminine to

masculine rimes *Guillaume de Dole*, with 38%, stands midway between *Escoufle* and *Ombre*.¹⁰

Other and minor correspondences in versification may be seen in the general prevalence of sentences in two and four lines, in the recurrence of a caesura which breaks the eight syllable verse into 3 + 5, in the number of monosyllabic rime-words in *a* (also *ce* in *Escoufle* and *Guillaume de Dole*), and in the employment of the *tirade lyrique*, or couplets in monorime. Of this last feature of style, there are two instances in *Ombre*, nine in *Escoufle* and eight in *Guillaume de Dole*. From so many and so consistent similarities we may draw the conclusion, that from the point of view of their prosody the three poems not only belong to the same poetical school but are the work of one and the same poet.

This conclusion, which proceeds from likenesses in rime and rhythm, receives strong support in two peculiar expressions which are common to the three poems, but which are rarely found in the literature of the day. The one relates to marking time by the Landit fair at St. Denis:

Se Deus me lait veoir l'Endit (text *lundi*). *Ombre*, 370.

Et si voit que jusqu'al l'Endit. *Escoufle*, 6538.

Vos ne verrez devant l'Endit. *Guillaume de Dole*, 1593.

The other tells how the poet first describes a castle or town, which his characters are approaching, from a *monjoie*:

Tant qu'il vinrent a la monjoie
Du chastel o cele manoit.

Ombre, 224, 225.

Et tant qu'il sont a la monjoie
Venu de la Mahommerie.

Escoufle, 458, 459.

Tant ont erré k'a la monjoie
Vindrent de Tol en Loheraine.

Escoufle, 4354, 4355. Cf. 7568, 7569.

Tant a erré qu'a la monjoie¹¹
Vint de Maience mout matin.

Guillaume de Dole, 4183, 4184.

These two instances are the only ones we have noted where expressions coincide in all three poems. There are, however, a number of phrases common to any two of the three. Some have already been

⁷ Vol. XIII, cols. 347, 348.

⁸ *Escoufle*, pp. xliv–lii.

⁹ See *Modern Philology*, vol. IV, 662–664.

¹⁰ See *Escoufle*, p. 1.

¹¹ In the passages cited from *Escoufle* and *Guillaume de Dole* the word *monjoie* rimes with *joie*. For the passage in *Ombre*, three mss. read *joie* for the rime-word, but the editor has preferred the reading *voie* of the other three.

quoted by Meyer and Mussafia. We have made a few gleanings in their footsteps.

Common to *Ombre* and *Escoufle* is the coupling of *pitiés* with *gentillece* (sometimes also with *franchise*) :

Gentillece, pitiés, largece. *Ombre*, 210.
Et que gentillece et pitiés. *Ombre*, 362.
Mais se gentillece et pitiés
Vos prenoit de moi, et franchise
Ja nus qui d'amors chant ne lise.
Ombre, 498-500.

S'onques pitié ne gentelise
Ot en vos ne point de franchise.
Escoufle, 1509, 1510.

En pitié et en gentelise
Que cascuns li dist qu'il eslise.
Escoufle, 2269, 2270.

Common to *Ombre* and *Guillaume de Dole* are the rime-words, one whole line and parts of the other two, in the following citations :

Mal fait qui destruit et confont
Ce dont il puet estre al deseure !
Trop me cort force d'amors seure.
Ombre, 776-778.

Ha ! dame, mal fet qui confont
Ce dont il puet estre au deseure !
Tant li prient et corent seure.
Guillaume de Dole, 4970-4972.

Common to *Escoufle* and *Guillaume de Dole* is this line which describes Rumor, together with the rime-word of the preceding line and the rime syllable of the line following :

N'ot entre eus ne laide parole.
Renomée qui partot vole
En a porté la novele.
Escoufle, 8515-8517.

Quant il ot dit ceste parole.
Rénomée, qui partot vole,¹² cf. l. 1. 937.
Si m'amentut ceste pucele.
Guillaume de Dole, 5122-5124.

¹²The author (or authors) of our poems did not, however, invent this saying. A generation before it had appeared in Wace :

Renomee qui partot vole,
Et qui de poi fait grant parole.
Brut, 4663, 4664.

Benoit de Sainte-More may have inherited it from Wace :

Renomee qui partot vole
En a tenue grant parole.
Troie, 27409, 27410 (Joly's edition).

Definite allusions to *Troie* are made both in *Escoufle* (see

Another survival of *Escoufle's* phrases is met with in *Guillaume de Dole*, in the repetition :

C'est m'esperance, c'est ma joie,
C'est mes jouiaus, c'est mes soulas.
Escoufle, 1862, 1863.

C'est m'esperance, c'est ma vie,
C'est mes joiaus, c'est ma santez.
Guillaume de Dole, 3037, 3038.

Individual words peculiar to *Escoufle* and *Guillaume de Dole* include the participle *caleboté*—already noticed by Paul Meyer in the Errata to the vocabulary of *Escoufle*—and the noun *sicle* with the meaning of "pleasure" :

. . . Fortune a envie
De lor bon siecle et de lor vie.
Escoufle, 4467, 4468.

Qui onges fu en tels estors
Bien puet savoir quel siecle il orent.
Guillaume de Dole, 214, 215.

Puis que cil Guillaumes fu nez,
N'ot si bon siecle a nul sejour.
Guillaume de Dole, 3431, 3432. Cf. 5488, 5501.

The similarity of these citations possesses a significance which is easily understood, but in order to appreciate its full force it is advisable to recall here some of the observations made by Paul Meyer and Mussafia. The former had found the expressions *ce que*, *lues que* and *que que*¹³ common to the three poems, and the latter a peculiar meaning of the noun *manière*.¹⁴ Paul Meyer had also noted these lines from *Ombre* and *Escoufle* :

La colors li croist et avive. *Ombre*, 374.
Sa colors li croist et avive. *Escoufle*, 2982.

ll. 112, 113, etc.) and *Guillaume de Dole* (see ll. 40, 5318-5336).—In Wace's chronicle of *Rou*, which is later than *Brut* by a decade or more, Rumor is called "Novele" :

C'est une chose que novele
Que molt est errante e isnele.
Rou, 4945, 4946. Cf. 5905, etc.

Why did Wace change his phrase? Was it under the influence of Chrétien de Troyes? Or did Chrétien adopt the words of *Rou* in preference to the description of *Brut*?

Mout est tost allee novele :
Que rien nule n'est si isnele.
Érec, 4939, 4940. Cf. 6176.

Logic would perforce require an imitation of Chrétien by Wace.

¹³ See *Escoufle*, p. xlvi. For *que que* in *Guillaume de Dole*, see vocabulary to Servois' edition.

¹⁴ *Op. cit.*, 1897, Abh. VII, pp. 18, 19.

And Mussafia had corrected the following couplets in *Ombre* and *Guillaume de Dole*¹⁵:

Qui mout li toche près del cuer :
 "Sire, fait ele, alons la fuer.
Ombre, 719, 720.
 De ce qui plus li touche au cuer !
 Cel jor fesoit chanter la fuer.
Guillaume de Dole, 1329, 1330.

Among the coincidences of phrase found by Mussafia in *Escoufle* and *Guillaume de Dole*¹⁶ are these sentences which disclose quite clearly the workings of the poet's memory :

N'onques ne fu ne vis ne nés
 Qui oïst issir de sa bouche
 I. sairement n'un lait reproche.
Escoufle, 2042-2044.
 Dës cele hore que il nez fu,
 N'oï nuls issir de sa bouche
 Grant serement ne lait reproche.
Guillaume de Dole, 44-46.
 Nature les prent et remort¹⁷
 K'il les a norris et il lui.
Escoufle, 2274, 2275.
 Nature les prent et remort¹⁷
 Qu'il a entr'ax norriz esté.
Guillaume de Dole, 128, 129.

It may now be claimed that the results reached by the study of the phrasing and vocabulary of *Ombre*, *Escoufle* and *Guillaume de Dole* confirm the opinions which were based on the comparison of their versification. That they are the work of one and the same poet seems proven, so far as internal evidence can prove anything. Nor is there any difficulty on the subjective side. The spirit and purpose of the three poems harmonize. Their literary and social views are similar. It will also be noticed that the correspondence in their phrases occurs at unimportant points, by accident apparently rather than by design. There does not seem to be any intention to repeat a clause once coined when the same situation arises again. On the contrary, the likenesses of expression recur at unexpected places, and for the most part with variations, which could be attributed to lapses in the poet's memory, an unconscious and not a voluntary repetition. In fact, the im-

pression received from these very variations, these approximations to phrases and lines which had already been formulated, is that the poet made a distinct effort not to repeat himself. Such an idea on his part receives considerable confirmation from a study of the similes in the poems. Even where the comparison remains the same they do not correspond. So with the proverbs employed. Two of *Ombre* (ll. 384-386 ; 716, 717) are found also in *Guillaume de Dole* (ll. 3464, 3465 ; 1409, 1410). But their wording is quite different. None of the proverbs of *Escoufle* do service elsewhere.

Gaston Paris' assertion, therefore, may be taken as well grounded, and Jean Renart may be safely written down as the author of *Escoufle* and *Guillaume de Dole*. He had himself marked *Ombre* as his own. Should this literary paternity be conceded, the question of the order of composition of the three poems, though of subordinate interest, would arise. It is hardly possible, in view of what has already been said,¹⁸ to dispute the seniority of *Escoufle* in reference to *Guillaume de Dole*. But what of *Ombre*? Is there no way of determining its relative position? Both Meyer and Paris believe that *Ombre* is later than *Escoufle*, because of the abrupt manner in which the death of the hawk is referred to in *Ombre*. Without any preparation or other literary allusion, the poet of *Ombre* suddenly illustrates his argument by citing William's act of violence :

Par Guillaume qui despieca
 L'escole et arst, un a un membre,
 Si com li contes nos remembre,
 Puet on prover que je di voir.
Ombre, 22-25.

Meyer and Paris think that this unexpected citation is to be credited to pride of authorship, and it would appear that their reasoning must be correct. The only argument against their position is given by *Escoufle* itself. There the poet carefully distinguishes between his "roumans" and the "contes" which supplied his plot :

Mais c'est drois que li roumans ait
 Autretel non conne li contes.
Escoufle, 9074, 9075.

Pour çou si di c'on ne doit mie
 Blasmer le rouman pour le non.
Escoufle, 9098, 9099. Cf. 9056, 9059.

¹⁵ *Op. cit.*, 1897, Abh. VII, p. 8.

¹⁶ *Op. cit.*, 1896, Abh. XIV, pp. 30, 61 ; 1897, Abh. VII, pp. 28, 33, n. 1, 35, 43.

¹⁷ In both poems *mort* is the rime-word with *remort*.

¹⁸ See note 7, above.

After he had taken so much trouble to discriminate between his source and his own poem, it seems singular that the author should cast aside the discrimination entirely. The line in *Ombre* does not demand the sacrifice.

On the other hand, in favor of Meyer's and Paris' view is the signing of *Ombre* by its author. If Jean Renart wrote *Escoufle* and *Guillaume de Dole* he did not concern himself with transmitting that action to posterity. But he does claim *Ombre* and weaves his name into its lines, so that there should be no possibility of the *lai* becoming anonymous. Now the custom among Medieval writers seems to have been to establish a reputation before openly assuming literary responsibility. Their first works would be marketed without any other signature than the one provided by the heading or ending of the manuscript. Whether this custom holds good in the case of Jean Renart or not, it nevertheless occasions surprise to see that his longer and apparently more important poems furnish no hint as to the identity of their composer. We would, therefore, presume that they were earlier than the signed poem. At all events, they were less popular and were known to a smaller circle. The testimony of the manuscripts extant proves the greater vogue of *Ombre*.

Possibly because of the apparent priority of *Escoufle* to *Ombre*, Gaston Paris was led to set the composition of the former poem as far back as 1185. This date seems too early for various reasons. One is that the spirit of *Escoufle* is no longer the spirit of the poems of the eighth and ninth decades of the twelfth century. Its interest in the trials of true love is slight. That interest is subordinated to a desire to portray social customs and the life of the day.¹⁹ Again, the reference to the plot of *Escoufle* in *Guillaume de Dole* would show that only a short interval separated the two poems. Servois dates *Guillaume de Dole* between 1199 and 1201. *Escoufle* must have been written by 1198, because of the complimentary reference to the Countess of Champagne contained in ll. 5614, 5615. This countess could hardly be other than Mary, the patroness of poets, who died in 1198. Besides, *Escoufle* is to be sent to a count of Hainault. Gaston Paris evidently took

this count to be Baldwin V, who became count of Flanders also in 1191. But because of the proximity of *Escoufle* to *Guillaume de Dole* this dedication must be intended for Baldwin VI, who became count in 1195 and who left Hainault, in 1202, for Venice and Constantinople. Therefore, *Escoufle* could be plausibly assigned to the years 1196-1198. *Guillaume de Dole* follows after in 1199-1201 (?). If *Ombre* follows *Guillaume de Dole*, as well as *Escoufle* (it may, of course, come between them), then the development of Jean Renart's poetic talent took place between 1195 and 1205 approximately.

F. M. WARREN.

Yale University.

SIR THOPAS AND SIR GUY. I.

In seeking for parallels to the phraseology of Chaucer's *Sir Thopas*, it is natural to turn first to the romances which Chaucer himself mentions, *Octavian Imperator*,¹ *Perceval*,² *Horn Childe*, *Ypotys*, *Bevis*, *Sir Guy*, *Sir Libeaux*.³ A study of these in the earliest extant English versions gives the following results: to the phraseology of *Sir Perceval*, there is but one parallel in that of

- ¹ Say, felow, who shal hunten here
Quod I: and he answerde ageyn,
Sir, themperour Octovien.

Book of the Duchesse, ll. 366 ff.

This is generally taken as a reference to the romance. See Skeat's *Chaucer*, I, p. 472; Lounsbury, *Studies in Chaucer*, N. Y., 1892, 2, 302.

- ² *Sir Thopas*, l. 214 ff. Skeat, iv, 190 ff.

- ³ Men speke of romances of prys,
Of Horn child and of Ypotys,
Of Bevys and Sir Gy,
Of Sir Libeux and Pleyndamour.

Sir Thopas, ll. 186 f.

Of these, the *Ypotys* we have is not a romance in our sense of the word, but a didactic poem with nothing about it to suggest its place in such a list. It is, of course, possible that Chaucer knew something else of the name, but "romance" was an inclusive term in his day (see Skeat's note, v, 198). Chaucer himself applies it to Ovid's *Metamorphoses* (*Book of the Duchesse*, ll. 44 ff.); and the translator of Grosseteste's *De Principio Creationis* calls that serious work a romance (Horstmann, *Altengl. Legenden*, N. F., 1881, p. 349). *Pleyndamour*, if a separate romance, has never been identified (cf. Skeat, v, 199).

¹⁹ See *Mod. Lang. Notes*, XIII, cols. 345, 346.